



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

day. It is with this that she is really struggling. It is her great peril that she has allowed the army to so exalt itself over the nation that great masses of her people shut their eyes, stifle their best convictions and cry "*Vive l'armée*," utterly forgetful of the principles of freedom and justice on which the republic is built. The new ministry itself, desirous as it is to correct the injustice which has been done, is so paralyzed by the dominance of the army that it fears to pursue the open way of truth and justice.

It was this cowering submission of the nation to the army, and to the false ideas of safety and honor out of which the army has grown, that emboldened Esterhazy and Henry and their accomplices — some of them possibly among Dreyfus's judges — to sell military secrets to German officials, equally base and corrupt in the buying. Otherwise they would not have dared to give loose reins in that direction to their low mercenary spirit — a spirit which always grows and thrives where militarism prevails. It is this military enslavement of the nation to the army which makes possible the pitiable spectacle of a naturally great and noble people stooping to such depths of iniquity as are found in the Dreyfus infamy — the willingness, rather than displease their "idol," to see any number of guilty, dishonorable officers go free and the penalty of their accumulated crimes borne by one innocent man.

France may, and probably will, under the mighty moral pressure from without and the goading impulses of justice from within, right up the wrong done to Dreyfus. But she has a still graver and more difficult duty to perform. She owes it to herself and to the whole civilized world to deliver herself from the degrading slavery to which, out of pride, vengeance and false conceptions of national honor and glory, she has sold herself body and soul. If she does not do this, she will sink deeper and deeper into moral debasement and ruin. Rectification of the Rennes infamy may give temporary relief and strength, but it will give no permanent assurance against the recurrence of similar or equally shameful occurrences. There is but one way of lasting hope for the future. The army must go or France will perish.

But the rest of the civilized world is involved here more or less in the same great guilt. If the tremendous cry of moral offence and indignation which has arisen over the Dreyfus infamy had uttered itself with the same clearness and emphasis over the everywhere overshadowing deadliness of the militarism out of which this frightful episode sprang, there would be less doubt of its utter sincerity, and more hope of its producing some result really worth the breath spent.

Since the above was written Dreyfus has been pardoned. This is for him better than nothing, but it is

not justice in any real sense. The stigma, however, will not rest upon him but upon the government, which ought to have insisted that the course of legal proceedings should continue until his acquittal was complete. The government seems to have adopted its course in order to hush up the strife between the army and the opposers of injustice. But the covering up of guilt and letting an innocent man remain under the reproach of treason is a poor basis for peace. The army is still master.

---

### Editorial Notes.

#### Wars and War Rumors.

As we go to press the situation in the Transvaal dispute has reached a tension that cannot last many days. The Boers have increased their defences and have everything in readiness for the struggle. The fighting spirit is high among them. Great Britain is rushing troops to South Africa, and making hasty and extensive preparations in every direction for war. There is still said to be a hope of peace, but if there is it comes from the dread which each side has of the awfulness of the pending conflict and the uncertainty of the results. The disposition to make concessions seems to have ceased. The Orange Free State is determined to throw in its lot with the South African Republic, and this complicates the situation. It seems monstrous that at the very end of the century and so soon after the Peace Conference such a gloomy and foreboding state of affairs should be possible in any quarter of the globe, and more disheartening still that enlightened Great Britain, under a noble peace Queen, should have allowed her ambition of empire, expressing itself through the grasping perverseness of one of her statesmen, to bring her into such an unworthy and degrading dilemma. Almost any way out would be infinitely more creditable to both sides than to plunge with headlong fierceness into the murderous, bloody abyss of war. But we fear that the iniquity has gone so far that the cup must now be filled up, with what result to the world only God knows.

Meanwhile our own iniquity towards the Philippine population still goes on and accumulates. Recruiting continues, new regiments of young men are being sent over the Pacific to be corrupted, to sicken and die, Filipinos are being shot down and their shores desolated, the lying and deception of the commander at Manila is little diminished, the government refuses to take a single step to withdraw from the dishonorable situation, lest, forsooth, its "honor" should suffer in the eyes of the world, and its "political capital" be diminished at home.

There is as little prospect as ever that the struggle will soon be over. But it is the duty of all friends of peace and of American political principles to keep up

their protest and to carry on an incessant campaign for a reversal of the policy that is being pushed at so much expense and dishonor to the country, and to the temporary ruin of the only native movement for constitutional liberty and republican government ever undertaken in the far East. The plea that the government cannot now change its policy without dishonor in the eyes of the world is the veriest puerility. The changing of its policy is the only way in which it can ever get the least honor out of the situation. Persistence in an iniquity begun is always dishonorable, to a nation no less than to an individual. Equally puerile is the claim that we cannot fulfil the obligations to the civilized world assumed in the Paris treaty without going forward in the "pacification" of the Filipinos by the sword. What are these obligations, pray? The pacification and constitution of the Philippine inhabitants into orderly communities, if that is what is meant, can be infinitely better done by the reversal of the policy of conquest than by continuing it. The *supreme duty* of the government to-day is this reversal, and public opinion must be so aroused and solidified in this direction that no other course will be possible.

#### Hope of Disarmament.

Any one who has thought on the subject of disarmament knows the difficulties in the way of it in the present state of both national and international public opinion. Mr. White, chairman of the United States Commission at the Hague Conference, has given in a recent letter to Dr. Magill of Pennsylvania, a part of which we quote on another page, a very lucid and reasonable opinion on the subject. He says:

"As to disarmament, that is simply impossible at the present time. It requires long and careful preliminary studies by experts before any conference can propose any distinct plan.

Besides that, it must come after arbitration rather than before it. When arbitration shall have diminished the probability and frequency of wars or armaments, the arguments for the present enormous armies and navies, will be greatly diminished.

I believe that the diminution of armies and forces will begin in Europe within a few years, but it will be after careful comparative studies of the different forces, so that any nation will be prevented from gaining undue advantage in the process, and it will be greatly promoted by the likelihood of effective results from the arbitration scheme."

#### Easier to Do Right.

The *Manchester Guardian*, replying to some English papers which have described the Hague Conference as a failure, says that "In face of the arbitration project, *incomparably the most important document of its kind ever drafted*, such a conclusion seems particularly unfortunate. The chief difficulty to some minds is the fact that arbitration under the project remains purely voluntary, but to make that a stumbling-block is to miss the whole significance of the

project. To reject the arbitration project on that ground is to reject the whole of international law, which has been built up from the beginning without physical sanction. It is the virtue of an idea, as distinguished from the mere fact, that it must change and grow; and to refuse to admit that this idea has made enormous progress at the Conference is simply to knock one's head against a wall of very hard facts. No one has ever believed that the Peace Conference would make it impossible for nations to do wrong. Its proudest boast is that it has made it more difficult to do wrong, a little easier to do right. The Conference at The Hague was precluded from discussing the question of peace in some of its most important and most practical aspects. It had to cry "Peace!" when there was no peace. All this is true, and yet one is not going to bandy reproaches of hypocrisy. There are some people whose character is so bad that their neighbors begin to suspect them of hypocrisy on their first symptoms of reform. The great Powers are in much the same plight. Yet there are worse evils than inconsistency, and the inconsistency of what the Powers have done at The Hague with what they have done elsewhere is not a reproach to, but a justification of, the Conference. It is reserved to the forces of Liberalism in every country to make the most of all the opportunities of reform — many of them splendid opportunities — afforded by the Conference, and to see to it that the undoubtedly genuine zeal in the cause of peace displayed by all the Powers at The Hague shall not be the passing mood of a moment of repentance, but a permanent state of the political mind."

The *Herald of Peace*, organ of the British Peace Society, commenting on the appeal of the people of the Netherlands to the British people to abstain from war with the Transvaal, speaks in the following strong terms:

"It will not do. There is no justification for such a war. We are one with the Dutch in their appeal on behalf of the Boers. Let us err, if error there be, on the side of patience and magnanimity and generous action. We say to our Dutch kinsfolk that 'Little England,' that is, the minority of the British people who are lovers of righteousness and fair dealing and humane and magnanimous treatment of others, whether they are inside the great British empire or out, do heartily respond to their appeal and join in their protests.

"There is no justification for such a war, or even, as the leader of one of the political parties avowed, for such preparations for war. If statesmen fail to keep their country out of war, the direst of all calamities, they have failed as statesmen, and that is usually the verdict of the electorate. If they carry the country into hostilities without strenuous efforts to preserve peace, they are culpable criminals. Nor are they less criminal if they fail to preserve peace where there is an avowed desire and a willingness on the part of their antagonists to do so, and when there is not only a repeated appeal for peace, but every effort is made to avoid war. But, beyond this, if powerful ministers disregard the laws of righteousness, and are not bound by the sentiment of magnanimity which should prevail in a great and strong nation, if they set themselves up as superior to the moral government of the universe, and become a law to them-

selves, then, all history being witness, the nation will suffer, the moral government will vindicate itself, and the betrayers of the truest and best interests of their country will be guilty not only of a political blunder, but a moral crime, and will go down to the hereafter of righteous judgment as colossal fratricides."

The annual meeting of the International Law Association at Buffalo on the thirty-first of August and two succeeding days was one of the most successful conferences held by the Association in recent years. The program of the meeting was given in our last issue, as well as some account of the origin of the Association. The success of the meeting at Buffalo consisted not so much in the character of the discussions as in the character of the delegates and the interest awakened thereby. The delegation from England was a large and influential one, headed by Sir William R. Kennedy, a member of the British High Court of Justice, who was president of the Conference. Other English delegates were Joseph Walton, Esq., T. G. Carver, Q. C., Judge Raikes, Q. C., Dr. W. Evans Darby, one of the Council of the Association, J. G. Alexander and Mr. Phillemore, secretaries, Alfred F. Morgan, Esq., Dr. F. J. Tompkins, etc. The Conference accepted the report of a committee of last year which had drawn up a plan for an international system of arbitration. It gave its approval of the work of the Hague Conference, and appointed a committee to study in detail the Hague Convention on the subject and report next year. It discussed the subject of marine insurance, that of the immunity of private property at sea in time of war, etc. On the subject of the immunity of private property at sea a very able address was given by Mr. Charles H. Butler of New York City, maintaining the position which has always been taken on that subject by the United States. The success of the Conference was due in a measure to the fact that it was held immediately after the meeting of the American Bar Association, on whose invitation it came to Buffalo. About sixty members of the Bar Association remained over to the International Law Conference. The presence of so many strong men of the International Law Association at the meeting of the Bar Association added much to the interest of the latter. The Bar Association again took strong ground in favor of permanent international arbitration, as it had done in preceding years. The committee of the Bar Association on international law, of which Hon. Everett P. Wheeler of New York City was chairman, presented a report covering thirty-five pamphlet pages, on the progress of international arbitration during the year. The report dealt chiefly with the work of the Hague Conference, with the advance in civilization which it marks, with the importance of its ratification,

and the necessity of arousing public attention in its behalf. The committee offered the following resolution, which was adopted by the Conference:

*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association renews with emphasis the strong declarations made by it in 1896 and 1897 in favor of the adjustment of controversies between nations by the medium of enlightened international arbitration, expresses its great satisfaction that the efforts which have been made to establish so beneficent a principle have culminated in the adoption at The Hague of a wise and statesmanlike agreement for that purpose, and its earnest hope that the Senate of the United States will approve the Convention of The Hague, and that the Administration will take such steps as may be proper to carry it into effect.

Something like the senseless war passion which preceded the Crimean War seems to be now prevailing in London. The opponents of the policy of Mr. Chamberlain towards the Transvaal attempted to hold a public demonstration on the 24th ult. in Trafalgar Square. When the speakers attempted to speak they were howled and groaned down, and pelted with rotten eggs, rotten apples and other missiles. The members of the peace associations were received with execration when they mounted the platform. A soldier and a marine, with clasped hands, were shouldered and carried around the square amid frantic enthusiasm. Opponents of the demonstration surrounded the platform and made several ugly rushes accompanied with fierce yells. The mounted police were finally summoned and cleared the square. The promoters of the demonstration held a private meeting in the evening and passed this resolution: "In consequence of the organized interruption of the anti-war demonstration in Trafalgar Square to-day, fomented by a section of the yellow and stock-jobbing press, this committee resolves to hold a public meeting in one of the largest metropolitan halls at an early date." Such conduct as that of this Boer-hating rabble needs no comment. One had supposed that the time for such beastly behavior had passed by in England. We suppose that Mr. Chamberlain was greatly pleased with this rotten-egg demonstration of his supporters! It was the legitimate fruit of the policy which he is pursuing, of the war spirit which he has evoked, and with which he will find it impossible to deal in a "civilized" way. We hope the friends of peace will courageously persist in their opposition to war with the Transvaal even if it costs them much greater annoyance and danger than came to them in Trafalgar Square. They have had a signal proof that they are right; for it is only wrong and blind passion that appeal to such methods as were used against them on the occasion of their attempt to call the English people back to reason and justice.

**Growth of the Navy.** The navy of the United States, including vessels of all classes, now numbers 244 ships and boats. When the 60 ships now under construction are completed the number of men-of-war will be carried up to 304. The increase is due in part to the addition of the 13 gunboats purchased by General Otis from Spain, and of the vessels captured during the war. Two years and more ago, when the serious suggestion was made that several tendencies of the nation indicated the approaching dangerous growth of militarism, the thought was hooted at as an absurdity. This country, it was effusively declared, never would become a military nation! But here we are to-day with an army of one hundred thousand men, sixty thousand of whom are, or are soon to be, fighting an alien, liberty-seeking people on the far side of the globe, where we never had and have not now a single rational and moral right to sovereignty. The fleet of the country is rapidly passing in size one after another of the fleets of the other powers, and we shall soon have outstripped all but England's. We shall then be in the mad and senseless race to beat her. Do the people of this "great and glorious country" know what all this means in the end? Do they know what a heritage of taxation, tyranny and woe they are deliberately, or blindly and stupidly, preparing for their children? It takes not even the remotest kinsman of a prophet to see the end standing out there in the near future in all its hideous reality.

**Delegates' Appreciation.** The Secretary of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, London, has received, in response to letters, some very interesting replies from some of the Delegates who did so much to make the Peace Conference a success. A noticeable feature of some of them is the sincere appreciation which they show of the work heretofore done by the peace organizations. Lord Pauncefoot, who expressed the same view to the editor of this paper, is especially hearty in his appreciation. He says:

"In those views, so forcibly and eloquently stated by you, I venture to express my entire concurrence and deep sympathy, and I request you to convey to the Council my heartfelt thanks for the generous tribute they have paid to the services I have been fortunate enough to render to the cause of arbitration at The Hague and elsewhere. I must be permitted to state, however, that my services count for nothing as compared to those so nobly rendered for many years by your Association, and which laid the foundation for the edifice which is justly admitted to have crowned the labors of the Conference."

Senator Descamps, of Belgium, chairman of the committee which drafted the Arbitration Convention, is equally appreciative. He says:

"I am convinced that an immense step has been taken

toward the triumph of a cause which is especially dear to us. The merit of it belongs, in great part, to those who, like you, have prepared opinion and so energetically and perseveringly demanded the action of the governments. Honor then, in the first place, to the International Arbitration and Peace Association! The work that we have accomplished is imperfect, without doubt. We count on you, as you may count on us, to promote its completion. Onward, then, toward this great end: 'To drive back Force and to advance Justice!'"

**Congregational Council.** Among religious events of the past month the International Congregational Council, held at Boston from the 20th to the 28th, was the most important. Nearly five hundred delegates were present, from the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, Hawaii, Japan, China, India, Scandinavia, etc. The most elaborate preparations had been made by the Congregationalists of Boston for their reception, and they were given most cordial welcome and entertainment, including trips to the historic places in the vicinity. Many of the ablest men in the denomination were present, the addresses were of a high order, the audiences overwhelmingly large, the interest unflagging to the end. All the great subjects with which the church deals were ably and freshly discussed,—the ministry, pastoral work, education, missions, social Christian work, Christian citizenship, etc. One of the marked features of the Council was the prevalence of the spirit of international Christian brotherhood. This was, however, unfortunately somewhat marred and weakened by a touch of the prevailing recrudescence of the war spirit of the day, and there was a dangerous approach on the part of a few speakers to demanding an Anglo-American Alliance of force, with a view of forcing civilization on those who are not as good as "we." The position of those who hold that war is fundamentally unchristian and unworthy of man, and therefore to be always abstained from, was dubbed "sweet-hearted sentimentalism." One session of the Council was given up to the subject of the Christian attitude toward war in international relations. The speakers were Dr. Lyman Abbott for America and Dr. Alexander Mackennal for England. The chief exhibition of the "war spirit" in the Council was in connection with the latter half of Dr. Abbott's address, on which we hope to comment more at length in our next issue. Dr. Mackennal's address, which we give in full on another page, was full of a lofty and pure Christian spirit. Its chief purpose was to show that war is a failure as a means of attaining high ends, that the Christian conscience can now with difficulty ever tolerate it, and that Christian people will not long be able to tolerate it at all.

**Dr. Darby in America.** Dr. William Evans Darby, Secretary of the Peace Society, London, has been spending several weeks in this country. He arrived in Boston on the 25th of August with the International Law Association delegates from Great Britain, of which he was one. He spent three days at the Peace Convention of the Universal Peace Union at Mystic, Conn., where he gave several addresses, and preached twice on Sunday. From Mystic he went to Buffalo and attended the meetings of the American Bar Association (whose "clever jingoism" was rather too much for a pacific Englishman) and of the International Law Association, of whose Council of direction he is a member. From Buffalo he went to Philadelphia, where he spent a week visiting the peace workers, addressing meetings, preaching, etc.; then a day or two was spent in Toronto on business. Dr. Darby went thence to New York for the Sabbath, September 24, and then came by Mystic to Boston for a few days at the International Congregational Council, to which he was a delegate. He set sail for home on the 27th ult. Dr. Darby is an indefatigable worker in the cause of peace and international goodwill, and we are very sorry that the time of his visit was not at a more opportune season for the holding of important meetings in the interest of the work. The English Peace Society, whose General Secretary he is, was never more vigorous and aggressive than now. It has the support, moral and financial, of a very large proportion of the peace workers in Great Britain, and spends more than two thousand pounds sterling per year in its various lines of work, most of which is received from private contributions made annually by its members and friends.

**Conscription in England.** England has so far held out against the conscription system which has now practically converted every able-bodied man on the Continent into a fighting machine. It has been said all along, and by none more loudly than by the military party, that Britain would never tolerate conscription, utterly opposed as it is to all the principles of her civil and religious liberties. But a number of clear-sighted Englishmen have for years plainly seen and declared that conscription is the inevitable last term of the militarism which is so rapidly laying its ruthless hands on all the institutions of the country. The fatal day seems now near at hand. It is reported that what is equivalent to conscription is to be introduced at once into Guernsey. The present militia is declared by the war office to be inefficient. The regular garrison is to be removed there, and replaced by a force of thirty thousand men between seventeen and thirty years of age, with a reserve. If the number cannot be secured by volunteering, then the deficiency will be made up by ballot, as it is euphe-

mistically called. The next step will speedily follow, and in less years than the number of one's fingers the entire country will be in the deadly clutches of enforced military service. *Ab uno disce omnes.*

**Friends' Protest.** The British Friends, who are always on the watch against any encroachment upon civil or religious liberty, have sent to Lord Salisbury and Lord Lansdown the following protest against the bill recently introduced into Parliament to amend the long disused Militia Ballot Act:

"This representative meeting of the Society of Friends views with grave concern the introduction into Parliament of a bill to amend the long disused Militia Ballot Act. It cannot but regard such a measure, taken in conjunction with statements made by members of the government, as preliminary to the enforcement of compulsory military service in this country. The Society of Friends has ever held that war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Christ; and, believing that His commands are those that claim allegiance above all others, they desire to record their protest against any extension of that militarism which is the increasingly recognized cause of so much evil. They hold that any attempt to enforce compulsory military service is an infringement of the liberty of conscience which we have so long enjoyed, and which is one of the greatest privileges of citizenship in this country. They therefore earnestly desire that no portion of these advantages should be withdrawn, and, further, that the Militia Ballot Act should be repealed and not amended."

**South America Fears U. S.** There has been a good deal of talk about a federation of the South American republics against the "paramount" pretensions of the United States. Though nothing practical is likely to come of it, the mere fact that the question has been raised is an evidence that national vanity has gone quite far enough in this country. Our business is, not to repel by our superciliousness, but to attract the other nations of this hemisphere, and of the world, too, for that matter, by kindly treatment and by faithful abstinence from all pretensions of dictating to them or lording it over them in any way whatever. This country is great, rich and powerful, but it can never be paramount anywhere, in the European sense of "paramount," without degrading itself and losing its right to be considered the foremost nation of the New World.

### Brevities.

. . . "I charge you to drop every paltry and insignificant thought for any man's success; it is nothing; I am nothing; Judge Douglass is nothing;—but do not destroy that immortal emblem of humanity, the Declaration of Independence."—*Abraham Lincoln.*